



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,467	08/26/2003	Terumasa Suyama	1018.1180101	8294
28075	7590	09/26/2005	EXAMINER	
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			YANG, CLARA I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,467

Applicant(s)

SUYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Clara Yang

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION*Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 29 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 7 and 8, the applicant argues that Duhome fails to teach a light control unit that activates the lighting device if the verification subject information matches the verification reference information and that Duhome fails to teach beyond a motion sensor-equipped light having a photocell to avoid activation during daylight hours. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Referring to Fig. 3, Duhome's security system includes a plurality of lighting devices (dim light 22, courtesy light 24, indoor lights 40, and low-voltage outdoor lights 36), portable transceiver 18 that generates and transmits an identification code (see Col. 4, lines 38-50), and fixed transceiver 16 (i.e., a light control unit) that is connected to the lighting devices. Per Duhome, fixed transceiver 16 receives portable transceiver 18's response signal, which includes identification information, and controls the activation and deactivation of the lighting devices (see Col. 3, lines 6-20; Col. 4, lines 20-37 and 57-62; and Col. 7, lines 3-21). Duhome clearly teaches that fixed transceiver 16 activates interior lights and exterior lights if a valid response signal is received from portable transceiver 18 (see Col. 7, lines 15-21). Duhome, however, fails to teach that the interior and exterior lights are also controlled by a selecting device for activating the light when the selecting device is in the enablement mode and for deactivating the light when the selecting device is in the disablement mode. Nevertheless, Duhome's dim light 22 and courtesy light 24 are controlled by photocell 20 (i.e., a selecting device), which has an enablement mode (i.e., when there is insufficient ambient light at the door) and a disablement mode (i.e., when there is sufficient ambient light at the door) (see Col. 2, lines 26-

Art Unit: 2635

37; Col. 5, lines 14-28; and Col. 7, lines 59-67). Duhamel also teaches that fixed transceiver 16 turns on courtesy light 24 if both photocell 20 and presence detector 14 have been activated (see Col. 5, lines 23-28). In other words, fixed transceiver 16 refrains from turning on courtesy light 24 if there is sufficient level of light at the door even if presence detector 14 has been activated. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Duhamel's interior and exterior lights such that they activated when fixed transceiver 16 receives a valid response signal is received from portable transceiver 18 and when photocell 20 is in an enablement mode in order to conserve energy by activating the interior and exterior lights only when ambient lighting is insufficient.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 16 and 17 are allowed.
3. Claims 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 2635

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 3-6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duhamel et al. (US 5,541,585).

Referring to claims 1 and 11, Duhamel teaches a security system for controlling building access. Regarding claim 11, Duhamel's security system, as shown in Fig. 3, comprises: (a) dim light 22, courtesy light 24, indoor lights 40, and low voltage outdoor lights 36; (b) portable transceiver 18 (i.e., an electronic key) for generating and transmitting a unique identification (ID) code (i.e., verification subject information) via radio frequency (RF) (see Col. 4, lines 38-50); (c) fixed transceiver 16 for wirelessly receiving portable transceiver 18's ID code, verifying the received ID code with previously learned ID codes (i.e., verification reference information), and activating and deactivating lighting devices (see Col. 4, lines 20-37 and 57-67; Col. 5, lines 1-4; and Col. 7, lines 3-21 and 39-50); and (d) a lock control unit, which is formed by fixed transceiver 16 and lock mechanism 56, for receiving portable transceiver 18's ID code, verifying the ID code with previously learned ID codes, and locking or unlocking of a door in accordance with the verification (see Col. 4, lines 57-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-13). Because Duhamel's fixed transceiver 16 controls the indoor and outdoor lights (see Col. 7, lines 15-21), fixed transceiver 16 functions as a light control unit. Duhamel's security system also has a photocell 20 (i.e., a selecting device) for enabling the activation of dim light 22 and courtesy light 24 (see Fig. 3; Col. 2, lines 26-37; and Col. 5, lines 14-28). Though Duhamel teaches fixed transceiver 16 activating indoor and/or outdoor lighting if a received ID code matches a learned ID code (see Col. 7,

lines 15-21), Duhamé omits activating indoor and/or outdoor lighting only if a valid ID code has been received and photocell 20 has been activated. Nevertheless, per Duhamé, fixed transceiver 16 turns on courtesy light 24 if both photocell 20 and presence detector 14 have been activated (see Col. 5, lines 23-28). In other words, fixed transceiver 16 refrains from turning on courtesy light 24 if there is sufficient level of light at the door even if presence detector 14 has been activated. Thus, photocell 20 has an enablement mode and a disablement mode. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Duhamé's security system such that fixed transceiver 16 activates indoor and/or outdoor lighting if a valid ID code has been received and photocell 20 has been activated because energy is conserved when indoor and/or outdoor lighting are turned on only when the level of light is insufficient. Duhamé also teaches the limitations of claim 1 since the claim's limitations are substantially similar to those of claim 11.

Regarding claim 3, Duhamé's photocell 20 (i.e., selecting device) selects the enablement mode when the level of light is at or below a predetermined level and selects a disablement mode when the level of light is above the predetermined level (see Col. 5, lines 14-28).

Regarding claim 4, Duhamé's security system further includes an intercom control unit 42 having one or more door unlock switches that allow a person inside the building to lock or unlock a door for someone outside the building who lacks the appropriate key or portable transceiver 18 (see Col. 2, lines 44-48); thus portable transceiver 18 is a key for locking and unlocking a door.

Regarding claim 5, Duhamé teaches a lock control unit, which is formed by fixed transceiver 16 and lock mechanism 56, for receiving portable transceiver 18's ID code, verifying the ID code with previously learned ID codes, and locking or unlocking of a door in accordance

Art Unit: 2635

with the verification (see Col. 4, lines 57-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-13). As explained in the rejection of claims 1, 4, and 11, portable transceiver 18 is an electronic key for transmitting an ID code (i.e., a signal related to the locking and unlocking of the door) via RF.

Regarding claim 6, as shown in Fig. 1, Duhome's portable transceiver 18 is used to access a building via a conventional door opening 10 (see Col. 1, lines 6-8 and Col. 3, lines 64-65). Because Duhome discloses that fixed transceiver 16 can activate devices such as kitchen lights, thermostats, televisions, living room lights, etc. (see Col. 6, lines 39-46), it is understood that Duhome's building includes a house.

Regarding claim 10, per Duhome, fixed transceiver 16 performs basic lighting, such as turning on indoor and/or outdoor lights, when the received ID code matches a learned ID code and performs security lighting, such as causing the indoor and/or outdoor lights to flash, when it fails to receive a valid ID code (see Col. 7, lines 3-21 and 39-50).

7. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (US 2003/0112122) in view of Duhome (US 5,541,585).

Referring to claims 1, 3, and 11, Hu teaches universal residence and vehicle locking and unlocking system. Regarding claims 1 and 11, as shown in Fig. 1, Hu's system 2 comprises: (a) security alarm box 14 having a warning light (see Section [0019]); (b) remote control 4 (i.e., a portable device or electronic key) having an RF frequency transmitter for generating and transmitting an RF signal (i.e., verification subject information) to lock and unlock a vehicle's doors and a residential two-way or three-way deadbolt door (see Sections [0001], [0007], [0009], and [0019]), as called for in claims 1 and 11; and (c) activator 12 (i.e., a lock control unit) for receiving remote control 4's RF signal and locking or unlocking a vehicle's doors and a residential two-way or three-way deadbolt door based on the received RF signal (see Sections

Art Unit: 2635

[0019]-[0021] and [0023]), as called for in claim 11. Because Hu teaches that (1) remote control 4 has a door lock arming (i.e., locking) button 20, a door lock opening (i.e., unlocking) button 22, a door security alarm activation button 24, a vehicle door locking and security activating button 26, a vehicle door unlocking button 28, and a trunk opening button 30 (see Section [0022]) and that (2) specific RF signals activate and deactivate the locking systems of the vehicle and a residence (see Section [0019]), activator 12 must verify the received RF signals with reference information in order to determine what actions need to be taken (if any) and to control the locking and unlocking in accordance with the verification. Hu, however, fails to teach: (1) a lighting device and a light control unit connected to the lighting device (as called for in claims 1 and 11); (2) a selecting device for selecting an enablement mode and a disablement mode, wherein the light control unit activates the lighting device if the received RF signal matches the reference information and if the selecting device selects the enablement mode (as called for in claims 1 and 11); and (3) the selecting device selecting the enablement mode when the ambient light surrounding the lighting device is equal to or below a predetermined value and selecting the disablement mode when the ambient light surrounding the lighting device is greater than the predetermined value (as called for in claim 3).

In an analogous art, as described in the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 11, Duhamel's security system, as shown in Fig. 3, comprises: (a) dim light 22, courtesy light 24, indoor lights 40, and low voltage outdoor lights 36; (b) portable transceiver 18 for generating and transmitting a unique ID code via RF (see Col. 4, lines 38-50); (c) fixed transceiver 16 for wirelessly receiving portable transceiver 18's ID code, verifying the received ID code with previously learned ID codes, and activating and deactivating lighting devices (see Col. 4, lines 20-37 and 57-67; Col. 5, lines 1-4; and Col. 7, lines 3-21 and 39-50); and (d) a lock control unit,

Art Unit: 2635

which is formed by fixed transceiver 16 and lock mechanism 56, for receiving portable transceiver 18's ID code, verifying the ID code with previously learned ID codes, and locking or unlocking of a door in accordance with the verification (see Col. 4, lines 57-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-13). Because Duhamé's fixed transceiver 16 controls the indoor and outdoor lights (see Col. 7, lines 15-21), fixed transceiver 16 functions as a light control unit. Though Duhamé teaches fixed transceiver 16 activating indoor and/or outdoor lighting if a received ID code matches a learned ID code (see Col. 7, lines 15-21), Duhamé omits activating indoor and/or outdoor lighting only if a valid ID code has been received and photocell 20 has been activated. Nevertheless, per Duhamé, fixed transceiver 16 turns on courtesy light 24 if both photocell 20 and presence detector 14 have been activated (see Col. 5, lines 23-28). In other words, fixed transceiver 16 refrains from turning on courtesy light 24 if there is sufficient level of light at the door even if presence detector 14 has been activated. Thus, photocell 20 has an enablement mode and a disablement mode. Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Duhamé's security system such that fixed transceiver 16 activates indoor and/or outdoor lighting if a valid ID code has been received and photocell 20 has been activated because energy is conserved when indoor and/or outdoor lighting are turned on only when the level of light is insufficient. Regarding claim 3, Duhamé's photocell 20 (i.e., selecting device) selects the enablement mode when the level of light is at or below a predetermined level and selects a disablement mode when the level of light is above the predetermined level (see Col. 5, lines 14-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hu's system as taught by Duhamé because a residential security system having a plurality of lighting devices and a light control unit connected to the

Art Unit: 2635

lighting devices for activating and deactivating the lighting devices based on a verified ID code enables indoor lights to activated without user intervention as a person enters the residence, thereby improving security, safety, and convenience (see Duhamel, Col. 3, lines 6-20; Col. 4, lines 57-62; Col. 6, lines 39-46; and Col. 7, lines 3-21).

Regarding claim 4, as explained in the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 11, Hu's remote control 4 has an RF frequency transmitter for generating and transmitting an RF signal (i.e., verification subject information) to lock and unlock a vehicle's doors and a residential two-way or three-way deadbolt door (see Sections [0001], [0007], [0009], and [0019]).

Regarding claim 5, as explained in the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 11, Hu's system 2 includes activator 12 (i.e., a lock control unit) for receiving remote control 4's RF signal, verifying the received RF signal with reference information, and locking or unlocking a vehicle's doors and a residential two-way or three-way deadbolt door based on the received RF signal (see Sections [0019]-[0023]).

Regarding claim 6, one of Hu's doors is a door 6 of a house, and activator 12 is located near door 6 to control the locking and unlocking of door 6 via remote control 4 (see Fig. 1 and Sections [0006], [00019], and [0020]-[0023]).

Regarding claim 7, Hu's other door is a door of a vehicle 16, as shown in Fig. 1. Vehicle 16 has its own RF-operated locking and unlocking mechanism (i.e., lock control unit) for locking and unlocking the vehicle door based on the RF signal received from remote control 4 (see Sections [0007], [0009], [0019], and [0022]).

Regarding claim 8, one of Hu's doors is a door 6 of a house, and activator 12 is located near door 6 to control the locking and unlocking of door 6 via remote control 4 (see Fig. 1 and Sections [0006], [00019], and [0020]-[0023]).

Art Unit: 2635

Regarding claim 9, Hu's system 2, as modified by Duhame, includes low voltage outdoor lights 36 (see Duhame, Fig. 3; Col. 3, lines 6-20; Col. 6, lines 39-46; and Col. 7, lines 3-21). Low voltage outdoor lights are typically used to illuminate gardens, outdoor walkways, driveways, patios and other areas or to spotlight sculptures, trees, structures and other objects. Thus Hu and Duhame teach a plurality of lamps for light an area, such as a walkway or driveway, that is in between door 6 and where the vehicle is parked.

Regarding claim 13, as explained in the rejections of claims 7 and 8, Hu's system includes: (a) door 6 of a residence and a door of vehicle 16 (see Fig. 1 and Sections [0006], [0007], and [0019]-[0023]); (b) activator 12 (i.e., a first lock control unit) located near door 6 to control the locking and unlocking of door 6 via remote control 4 (see Fig. 1 and Sections [0006], [00019], and [0020]-[0023]); and (c) RF-operated locking and unlocking mechanism (i.e., a second lock control unit) located at vehicle 16 for locking and unlocking the vehicle door based on the RF signal received from remote control 4 (see Sections [0007], [0009], [0019], and [0022]).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2635

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clara Yang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3062. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 7:00 PM, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on (571) 272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CY
20 September 2005


BRIAN ZIMMERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER